

THE MISSIONARY RECORDER:

A REPOSITORY OF INTELLIGENCE FROM
EASTERN MISSIONS, AND A MEDIUM OF GENERAL INFORMATION.

A REPRINT OF THE IMPORTANT ORIGINAL MATTER
OF THE NUMBERS FOR JANUARY, FEBRU-
ARY, AND MARCH, 1867.

(For The Missionary Recorder.)

ON THE MEANING AND POWER OF THE TERM "JEHOVAH"

BY REV. T. P. CRAWFORD.

In the investigation of the subject indicated by the above title, during several years past, I have pursued two courses. One has been to subject the term to a process of etymological criticism; the other, to study its meaning and power by the light of the various contexts in which it occurs in the Bible. I am convinced that we, at the present day, know nothing about the origin of the term Jehovah. The learned disagree among themselves on the subject, and have nothing better than a supposition to offer. Some suppose it to have had a foreign origin, and to be radically the same as *Ju* in Jupiter, or the *Joe* in *Joris*. Some, that it came primarily from Egypt or India. Ancient Greek authors say that Moses gave laws to the Hebrews from a God called *J A O*. Gesenius supposes it to be derived from the verb *havah*, to be, since the three consonants, *h*, *v*, *h*, are the same in both words. But it is evident from what he says, and his manner of saying it, that he is far from being satisfied in his own mind. He gives it merely as an opinion, without attempting to establish the fact by any sufficient proof. He never meant to be understood as settling the question.

True, he refers us to two passages of Scripture which he thinks point to such a derivation. One of these is Exodus 15: 14, 15; "And *Elohim* said unto Moses, say unto the children of Israel, I AM THAT I AM hath sent me unto you. And *Elohim* said moreover unto Moses, say to the children of Israel, *Jehovah*, God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." Now, what bearing this quotation has on the question of the derivation of the term Jehovah I am wholly unable to see. It would show that *Elohim*, rather than *Jehovah*, is derived from the verb to be; for existence, or immutability, is here predicated of

Elohim, and not of Jehovah. The "moreover" in the beginning of the 15th verse shows that it was not the design of *Elohim* to re-assert his immutability by calling himself *Jehovah*, but to assert the additional fact that he was SUPREME in power, and would therefore be able to deliver his covenant people from the hand even of Pharaoh, the most powerful monarch on earth.

The meaning of the quotation may be expressed thus: "*Elohim*, whose mind never changes, whose word and purposes are immutable (*I am that I am*'), whose name and power is Supreme (*Jehovah*'), has sent Moses and will support him in his controversy with Pharaoh, and he shall deliver you from his hand; therefore fear not to trust your lives and all you have to his control."

The other passage referred to by Gesenius is Hosea 12: 5; "Even Jehovah, God of hosts; Jehovah is his memorial," (or name.) For my life I cannot see what bearing this text has on the origin of the term *Jehovah*. In what way does it show that it is derived from the verb *havah*, to be? If we attach the idea of immutable to it in this text, it will make sense; but if we attach Supreme, it will make a better sense, and one more in harmony with the context, as its use in the 2nd and 9th verses of the chapter will show. Suppose we read it thus: "Even Jehovah, God of hosts, Supreme is his name." The 2nd verse reads, "Jehovah has a controversy with Judah and will punish Jacob according to his ways," &c. How would it sound to say "immutable has a controversy," &c? The idea here evidently is, "He that has sovereign power and authority over Judah and Jacob has a controversy with them, and will punish them according to their ways." That the word *Jehovah* differs from *havah*, to be, by only one letter, is known and fully admitted; but it is by no means certain that this agreement is not merely accidental; like our verb *be* and the insect *bee*, or like the noun *liver*, an organ of the body, and *live*, the derivative of the verb to live. These two last named words, though identical in orthography and sound, have different origins and different meanings. This sort of similarity in words is found in all languages.

the Hebrew not excepted. Would we be justified in saying that *Becon* (a surname), *beatify*, *betelnut*, *behemoth*, *behold*, *besiege*, and hundreds of other words of a like kind, are derived from or compounded with the verb *be*, because these two letters happen to form a syllable in them? Why may not *Jehovah* be a word of this sort?

We must remember that the Pentateuch contains the most ancient writings in the Hebrew language, and that we are ignorant of the languages which were its predecessors—what words underwent changes, what ones remained the same, and what foreign ones had become naturalized prior to the time of Moses. Gesenius says that “the Hebrew language as found in the Pentateuch is as perfect in structure as it ever became.” Now, every one knows that a language must have previously undergone many and important changes before it reaches perfection in structure.

Etymology, under the most favorable circumstances, is by no means a reliable guide to the meaning and power of words. Webster in his unabridged Dictionary makes the following judicious remarks on this subject: “I know of no work in any language in which words have been generally traced to their original signification with even tolerable correctness. In a few instances their signification is too obvious to be mistaken; but in most instances the ablest etymologist is liable to be misled by first appearances, and the want of extensive investigation.” “I have,” says he, “been often misled by these means, and have been obliged to change my opinions as I have advanced in my inquiries. Hence the tendency of my researches has been very much to increase my caution in referring words to their originals, and such, I am persuaded, will be the result of all critical and judicious investigations into the history and affinities of language.”

Even admitting that the term *Jehovah* was derived from the verb *to be*, that fact would not determine its meaning and power in Old Testament times.

No fact is better established than that derivatives do not always retain the meaning of their originals. They frequently depart so far as to leave nothing in common between them. Let me give a few examples by way of illustration. *Heathen* is from *heath*, a kind of shrub, and meant in old English dwellers among the heath, or country people of the ruder sort. Now it means worshippers of idols wherever they may dwell, the polished as well as the rude. The etymological meaning of *pagan* is villager; *manners*, handiwork; *pistol*, a dr-er or spout; *mother*, mud or mould; *husband*, a builder or farmer; and *bride*, a piece of bread. *Heat* and *hate* were originally one word. Gesenius also says that “the Hebrew is only one branch of a great parent stock in western Asia, which origin-

ally embraced Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylon, Arabia and Ethiopia.” Now, who knows where or how the terms *Elohim* and *Jehovah* originated, or through how many parent and cognate dialects they had passed, and what changes they had undergone, ere they were written down in the Pentateuch, and on till the Hebrew became a dead language about the time of Christ? We have some idea of the change wrought upon the English language during the last thousand years. The Saxon, prior to the Norman conquest, is to us of this day a dead language. For instance, our word *Lord* was then written *Hlaford*, with two syllables. It is now written in one, three letters left out, and the pronunciation quite different. It was then applied mostly to men of certain rank—it is now applied mostly to God.

May not *Jehovah* likewise be some old word contracted, and wrested from its original application to some human office (monarch, for instance), and applied exclusively to God in the Hebrew language? *Jehovah*, or its equivalent in sense, is certainly a most ancient term. Eve, the mother of the human race, is represented as saying at the birth of her first son, “I have gotten a man from *Jehovah*.” Now, three very important questions arise at this point, and bear directly on the subject under consideration.

First: was the word used by Eve transferred (either directly or gradually) from language to language, and from generation to generation, down to the time when the Hebrew became a dead language? This embraced a period of at least 5500 years if we follow the chronology of the Septuagint, evidently the most reliable text on this point now in our possession. Or, second: was the word translated from time to time? Or, third: was it sometimes transferred and sometimes translated? If it was thus transferred into the Hebrew, then the two syllables composing it would be written as representatives of sound and not of meaning, and one of them would as likely be the verb *havah* as any other word in the language. In that case it certainly would not be a derivative in any sense, and any attempt to show its etymological origin and import would inevitably lead to erroneous conclusions.

Into the Chinese Bible the translators have transferred many Hebrew and Greek names and terms. Suppose, in after years, some learned Chinaman should attempt to explain the meaning of these by discussing the radical import of the various characters of which they are composed. What a medley of nonsense he would make of it! Or, suppose we should discuss in this way the transferred term *behemoth*, found in the 40th chap. of Job. We should get the following result:—*be* is the substantive verb and means to exist, to remain, hence self-existent, everlasting, or immutable: *he* is a pronoun

the sign of the masculine gender, and is frequently used for male, as *he-goat*; *moth* is a worm, the name of a small worm which breeds in and consumes old books, woollens, &c. Thus it is plain that Job's terrible "*behemoth*" is the self-existent and everlasting bookworm so much dreaded by authors, and which has devoured so many learned tomes of the past, and is destined to continue his work of destruction till the end of time!

But if the word used by Eve was translated from language to language as it came on down, then its meaning was finally expressed in Hebrew by the word *Jehovah*; but that fact would not decide the question whether it was a *native*, or a *naturalized* word. If it was a *native* term, in that case *only* could it be derived from the verb *havah*, and would be the equivalent of our word *being*, and nothing more—as that is the *only* noun (I believe) which is derived from the verb *to be*. But if it is a *naturalized* term, then it has nothing in common with *havah*, except an accidental similarity of orthography.

On the supposition that it is a pure native term, then there would only remain the *mere probability* that it might be derived from the verb *to be*, since it might with an equal amount of probability, be perfectly independent of it—as independent as *bee*, an insect, is of the verb *be*; or *liver*, an organ of the body, is of the verb *live*. And further, by remembering how prone derivatives are to lose the meaning of their primitives, especially when appropriated from a common to a sacred use, we will be able both to see and to feel how very *narrow*, uncertain, and unsatisfactory, are the grounds upon which rests the commonly received opinion, that *Jehovah* is derived from the verb *to be*, and therefore means the self-existent Being—in the very face of the fact that there is not to be found *one text* in the whole Bible which requires such a sense.

If we would arrive at a clear apprehension of the meaning and power of term, we must first dismiss from our minds all second hand and preconceived opinions, and go in person to the Bible, and study it by the direct light of the various contexts in which it occurs. This course is a laborious one; but it is the true one, and will be sure to dispel many a cloud, and bring a rich harvest of thought to the diligent student. The study of the term *Jehovah* will give the key to the Bible Kingdom. With these remarks I dismiss the etymological branch of my inquiries. Some persons consider *Jehovah* not an ancient term in any sense, but suppose that God originated and first applied it to himself as a name, during his conversation with Moses, as found in Exodus 6: 1-3; viz.: "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am *Jehovah*. And I appeared to (Heb. *was to*) Abraham,

to Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them." Though I regard the above supposition as to the origin of the term *Jehovah* as erroneous, still it does not affect in the least my views of its meaning and power. How could the name have originated in this way, since all the Patriarchs addressed God or spoke of him under this title, built altars and sacrificed to him as *Jehovah*? They could not have been ignorant of the word, like ourselves they did not comprehend its full meaning and import. I would therefore give the sense of the passage, making it harmonize with the previous history and the circumstances under which it was spoken, by rendering it thus: "And *Elohim* spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am *Jehovah* (your sovereign, instead of Pharaoh), and I *seemed* (the word rendered *appeared* does not mean to manifest oneself, as in Genesis 17: 1, but is a neuter verb and means *was to*, or *seemed to be to*) to be to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God the Almighty, but as to my name, or title, *Jehovah* (the Sovereign), I was not comprehended by them." They knew him as God the Almighty, but not as God their Sovereign. It was impossible for the Patriarchs to realize the import of the term *Jehovah*, to look upon him in the light of their own Sovereign or King, while as yet they were only a pilgrim family dwelling in tents in a land where they had no inheritance. They had not become a people, a nation, a kingdom; though they were by promise and anticipation the heirs of the world, of that kingdom which was to fill the earth and be an everlasting kingdom, with God, *Jehovah*, as Sovereign at its head. The Patriarchs had seen and heard of many of the displays of God the Almighty, but they had seen none of his displays as God their Sovereign.

When *Elohim* met with Moses, and addressed him in the language recorded in the 6th chapter of Exodus, the chosen family of Abraham had "multiplied, and filled the land of Egypt;" it had become a *people*—a nation ready for its king. He accordingly informs Moses that he is about to assume all the functions of royalty, and to make them and the Egyptians know the import of his name *Jehovah*; and commands him to say unto the children of Israel, "I am *Jehovah* (fear not Pharaoh, though he be the most powerful sovereign on earth, for I am more powerful than he), and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments; and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am *Jehovah* (the Sovereign)."

your God." Thus saying, he bade Moses "go in and speak unto Pharaoh, king of Egypt, that he let the children of Israel go out of his land;" or, in other words, "tell him that I claim their allegiance—they are my people, not his, and I join issue with him on the point of sovereignty over them, and challenge him to the combat." His servants, Moses and Aaron, went in and delivered the challenge in the following words: "Thus saith Jehovah, God of Israel, let *my people* go, that they may *serve me*." Here for the first time he calls the children of Israel *his people*, and here, in the very face of Pharaoh, he sets up his claim of sovereignty over them. Here God puts his title Jehovah square up against the title Pharaoh. Pharaoh understood the challenge, at once bade it defiance, and said: "who is Jehovah, that I should obey *his* voice to let Israel go?" Saying this, he drove them from his presence, and increased the burdens of the people. After this, when the officers of the children of Israel saw their evil condition, they went unto Pharaoh and cried for mercy; but he called them idle, and drove them back to their work.

Then Jehovah said unto Moses, "Rise up early in the morning, and stand before Pharaoh, and say unto him: Thus saith Jehovah (the Sovereign), God of the Hebrews, let *my people* go, that they may *serve me*; for I will at this time send all my plagues upon thine heart, and upon thy servants, and upon *thy people*, that thou mayest know that *there is none like me* in all the earth; and in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, to show in thee my *power*, and that my name might be declared (as *Supreme*) throughout all the earth. As yet exalteth thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go? Behold, tomorrow about this time, I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now. And Jehovah rained hail mingled with fire upon all the land of Egypt."

The proud heart of Pharaoh was humbled for a while, and he called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them: "I have sinned this time; *Jehovah is righteous*, and I and my people are wicked. Entreat Jehovah, for it is enough, and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer." But he soon changed his mind, refused to yield the point at issue, and the controversy waxed hotter and hotter—Jehovah on the one side, and Pharaoh on the other, contending for the *sovereignty* over the children of Israel. At last, Pharaoh and his hosts were overthrown in the Red Sea, Jehovah came off victorious, and began to reign as king over his chosen people Israel. On this grand and decisive occasion, their national birthday, Moses and the people sang a song of triumph to

Jehovah, their God and King. Let the reader examine this song, in the 15th chapter of Exodus, and notice the many expressions therein significant of power, supremacy, &c., applied to Jehovah. It is evident that Moses and the children of Israel deeply felt that Jehovah had vindicated his claim to supremacy over them, and that he was their *Ruler*, as well as their God. They gave him the first place among the mighty ones—declared his name to be Jehovah, that is *Supreme*, as the context plainly shows.

I therefore regard the term Jehovah as a REGAL TITLE, or an appellation expressing *sovereign power and authority*, not only over the universe at large, but *especially* over the kingdom of Israel. I think I have discovered a test by which I can show that Jehovah is a *title of regal authority and power*, and not a *proper name*, nor an *abstract term* of any kind. The test is this: Jehovah, as used in the Bible, is construed with the term *hosts*, at a guess, more than a thousand times. Every Bible reader knows that "Jehovah of hosts" is a most common expression. Now, *whatever term in the English language will construe with hosts wherever JEHOVAH does, in such a manner as not to offend, but to invariably secure the approbation of our taste, is its equivalent, and will translate its sense and dignity.* Let us now apply the test to a number of abstract terms which have been supposed to express the meaning of Jehovah. Hosts means armies or troops. Let us say, "Being of hosts or armies," "Self-existent Being of hosts," "Infinite of hosts," "Essence of hosts," "Eternal," "Immutable," "Everlasting of hosts." Each and all of these are inadmissible. An English ear rejects them at once. In fact, no *abstract term* will suit; *e. g.*, "Majesty of hosts," "Highness of hosts." Neither will these abstract terms construe with possessive pronouns, as Jehovah sometimes does. See Psalm 45: 11—"For he is *thy* Jehovah; worship thou him." Say, "He is *thy* self-existent Being; worship thou him." Hosea 12: 14—"Ephraim's reproach shall *his* Jehovah return upon him." Say, "his self-existent Being shall return upon him." It is clearly not admissible. Let us now test some *proper names*, and say, "Wellington of hosts or armies," "Grant of hosts," "Lee of hosts." These are equally inadmissible.

The question then presents itself, would the ancient Hebrew writers associate the term *hosts* with the word *Jehovah*, if in their minds it was an abstract term, meaning self-existent Being, or simply a proper name, seeing it cannot be so used in English nor—I believe—in any other language?

Let us now test in this way some common nouns and official titles, "Head of the hosts;

or armies," "Commander-in-chief of the armies," "Captain of the hosts," "Ruler or Supreme Ruler of hosts or armies." All these expressions are good English, and in harmony with the mode of expressing this idea in every language of which I have any knowledge. Is the Hebrew "Jehovah of hosts" an exception to the rule? It cannot be. The very nature of human thought and language forbids it. If we put the official title in the possessive case, we can say "the king's troops," "His Majesty's forces," &c. Now, it is well known that armies belong to and are under the command of the *Sovereign* in every State. To command the army is a *royal prerogative* in every kingdom, ancient or modern. "Lord of hosts" is not good English. It is a forced translation. It fails to fill the measure of "Jehovah," but corresponds to "Adonai." It is passive, rather than active—a title of respect, rather than of office. We say "lord of the mansion," "lord of the manor," but never "lord of hosts, or armies," except as a Bible expression. It never expresses sovereign power or authority, and therefore it is not able to take the place of Jehovah.

I shall now proceed to show that Jehovah belongs to the class of *regal titles*, expressive of an *active office*, and is equivalent to our English term, "the Sovereign," or "the Sovereign Ruler," "the Supreme Ruler."

The Bible conception of government is an absolute monarchy. The children of Abraham constitute the kingdom, God is king, and Jehovah is his title. All the prerogatives and functions of royalty and government are ascribed to him, and associated with the term Jehovah. This is the case, not in one or two isolated instances, but everywhere. *It is the leading idea in every context in which Jehovah is found.* Nothing inconsistent with this interpretation ever occurs in the Bible, so far as I have been able to discover.

Let us now attend to the manner in which Jehovah is employed in the Scriptures, and see if our interpretation of it is not sustained by the various contexts in which it occurs. In the first chapter of Genesis, where the work of creation is described, the term Elohim only is employed. But as soon as the *moral being*, man, comes on the theater of this world, and God begins to instruct, command, and otherwise govern him, the epithet Jehovah is added, and the formula becomes "Jehovah God." The whole transaction in the garden of Eden conveys to my mind the impression that God, as *sovereign*, is dealing with our first parents. In the *trial*, *condemnation*, and *banishment*, of Cain; in the destruction of the wicked by the *flood*, and the salvation of Noah, who *'found grace in the eyes of Jehovah'*; in the *infusion of tongues*; in the call of Abraham,

and making a covenant or treaty with him, pledging a certain course towards him and his seed, with a promise of a *country*, and other national blessings; in all these transactions the same impression is made. These are acts of government, such as only royal rulers are accustomed to perform, and all are ascribed to Jehovah, rather than to Elohim. In English we would say, the king did so and so; or, his majesty performed such and such deeds. In the Bible it is, Jehovah did so and so.

God told Moses again and again to say to Pharaoh: "I am Jehovah," or "thus saith Jehovah," expressions implying *power superior* to that of Pharaoh, and containing—if they meant anything under the circumstances—a threat. Pharaoh could fear nothing but power, and God not only told him to his face that he was Jehovah (Supreme Ruler), but that he would make him, and all the world, know that there is *none like Himself* in all the earth. He called the children of Israel *His people*, and demanded that Pharaoh should yield his usurped claim to their allegiance. None but sovereigns have a *people*, or can make such demands of another sovereign. Moses in his triumphant song said, "Jehovah shall reign forever and ever"—an expression very similar to the ancient and modern one, "Long live the king."

One of the first regal acts of Jehovah was to lay a tax upon his people, and appropriate to the use of his kingdom the first born of their males, both man and beast. At the institution of the Passover the Israelites are first called the hosts or army of Jehovah, and they are ever after so styled. Thenceforth he has a kingdom *de facto*, prime ministers (Moses and Aaron), a revenue, and an army. Soon after the host had crossed the Red Sea, Amalek, king of Edom, grandson of apostate Esau, came at the head of his troops and attacked Israel in the rear, when weary and faint, and well-nigh gained the victory. Through the prayers of Moses, Israel finally prevailed. Then Jehovah said unto Moses, "write this in a book for a memorial, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua; for I will utterly put out the name of Amalek from under heaven. And Moses built there an altar, and called the name of it "Jehovah, my banner;" or, in other words, erected over it the national flag of Israel with the word JEHOVAH inscribed upon it, and said, "because the hand of Amalek is lifted up against the *throne* of Jehovah, therefore Jehovah will have war with Amalek from generation to generation." (See Ex. 14: 14, 15.) Look at the meaning of this transaction. It is one of the sublimest on record. It is typical. The son and successor of apostate Esau, the Antichrist of the Old Testament, comes forth and attacks the infant kingdom of Israel. Moses, the faithful servant of God, feels the insult

offered to the *throne* of *Jehovah*, his sovereign. He throws Israel's banner to the breeze, and says, "in attacking Israel, he attacks the *throne* of my king; therefore my king will have war with him (and his successors) from generation to generation." The war then opened between Jehovah and Apostasy still goes on, waxing hotter and hotter. The name of Jehovah was thrown in the face of Pharaoh, the first monarch of the world. Here Jehovah, inscribed on the banner of Israel, is thrown in the face of Amalek, the head of the apostate race.

Kings, in ancient times, led forth in person their troops to battle. By all nations the king is regarded as head of the army. Jehovah is represented as being the same, and hence the expressions used so frequently, "Jehovah of hosts," "Jehovah is a man of war," "Jehovah fights for us," "the battle is of Jehovah," "who is on Jehovah's side?" "Jehovah will have war with Amalek," &c. Thus I could go on quoting passage after passage—for the Bible is full of such, showing that Jehovah is the great ROYAL DUX, or leader of the hosts of Israel; and that he wages ceaseless warfare against the enemies of his throne and people. The same idea is kept up in the New Testament.

Jehovah is not only head of the army, but he is also Lawgiver, Judge and King of his people. As soon as he had led Israel to Mt. Sinai, he came down in majesty and pomp, and wrote with his own finger the *fundamental laws* of his kingdom, on two tables of stone, and giving them into the hands of his minister, Moses, commanded him to deliver them to the people, as of perpetual obligation. He afterwards gave *statute laws*, and *commandments* in minutia, even down to weights and measures. In all these transactions Jehovah alone is the actor, and almost every law, statute, and command ends with the formula, "*I am Jehovah*," or "thus saith Jehovah,"—the Sovereign. To make laws is a prerogative of sovereignty alone.

That Jehovah is the Judge, or chief executive of his kingdom, is expressed in a great variety of forms. For example: "Jehovah shall judge his people," &c. Look almost where you will in the Bible, and you will find the various words expressive of this royal prerogative associated with the term Jehovah, rather than with any other of the numerous epithets by which God is designated. Thus it is Jehovah that judges, condemns, pardons, punishes, rewards, exalts, debases, threatens, encourages, and instructs his people, as sovereigns are wont to do.

As they generally begin or end their *official* acts with a "thus saith the King," or "this is a royal decree," so he usually begins or ends by saying "*I am Jehovah*," "thus saith Je-

hovah," "I am Jehovah of hosts," "I am Jehovah, God of hosts," or "I am Jehovah your God." Such expressions in such connections clearly convey the idea of sovereign authority and power. But this is not all. With the term Jehovah are associated all the *titles*, *insignia*, *honors*, and *reverence* of royalty. He is called "Governor of the nations," "Judge of all the earth," "Head over all," "Father," (the emperor of China is father and mother of his people,) "Most High," "Majesty," "Excellency," "King," &c. He is called *king* directly more than twenty times; as, "Jehovah is king forever and ever, and the heathen are perished out of his land," "yea, Jehovah sitteth king forever." In Isaiah 33:22, it is said, "Jehovah is our judge; Jehovah is our lawgiver; Jehovah is our king, and he will save us." Isaiah, in his first chapter, describes the divine majesty thus: "In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw also Jehovah sitting *upon a throne* high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Then said I, wo is me! for mine eyes have seen THE KING, JEHOVAH of hosts," &c. I will not attempt to quote all the passages in which he is styled king.

In harmony with the idea that Jehovah is king, he is said to *reign*, &c. Take a few specimen quotations: "Jehovah shall *reign* forever," "Jehovah *reigneth*, let the people tremble," "Jehovah *reigneth*, he is clothed in majesty," &c. His *throne* is frequently spoken of; as, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy *throne*," &c. His *kingdom* and *dominion* are also often referred to. His *honor*, *majesty*, and *glory*, are set forth in a great variety of ways. Take only one specimen, David's words in dedicating the materials which he had prepared for the building of the temple, viz.: "And David blessed Jehovah before all the congregation and said, Blessed be thou Jehovah, God of Israel our father, forever and ever. O Jehovah, thine is the *greatness*, and the power, and the *glory*, and the *victory*, and the *majesty*, for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is *thine*. Thine is the kingdom, O Jehovah, and thou art exalted as *head* over all." Jehovah has ministers and messengers around his throne, ready to receive his commands and execute his will. The authors of the Bible approach his presence with gravity and awe, and address their petitions in such manner and language as to show most clearly that they regard him not only as divine, but also as a royal personage. Elohim expresses the *divinity* of his character; Jehovah, the *sovereignty*.

I have examined the term as it occurs in every text in the Bible, and I now feel justified in saying that it is not a title of *stationary dignity*, as the terms Lord and Supreme Being are; but that it is one of *ceaseless, burning activity*. Jehovah is not enjoying the honors

of *otium cum dignitate*, but is ever discharging the functions of an all important office. I notice, further, that it is never applied but to one person, the God of Israel. I think it was most probably, in the primitive language of man, a generic term for king or ruler; but in after ages, as language changed, it became specific, being applied to the God of the Hebrews alone. Our English phrase, "the Pope," happily illustrates how a word in passing over from one language to another may become specific in its application, though still retaining the sense of the generic. *Pope* is from the Greek *papa*, and was the common or generic term for *father*; but it is now restricted in modern use to the *father*, or *head*, of the Roman Catholic Church. Again, the term *Jehovah* expresses nothing spiritual, mysterious or abstract; it is an anthropomorphic and personal word, by means of which God comes up before the mind as a sovereign—not a human, but a *divine sovereign*; and this double character is the source of our difficulties, both in our perceptions and language, regarding him. Hence, also, the ease and readiness with which the two terms, *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, interchange. There is a large common ground, while each has its own appropriate field.

I have endeavored in this paper to make out the appropriate field of the word *Jehovah*. *Elohim* occasionally enters it; but the *great body of the words in the Bible* expressive of sovereign power, authority, and government cluster around the term *Jehovah*. I believe that *Shangti* will translate it most happily, and that it ought to be *translated*, rather than *transferred* into the Chinese Scriptures. However, I will not argue this point. Those who admit that the term *Jehovah* fills the place in the Bible to which I have assigned it, will be able to determine for themselves whether *Shangti* will fill its conditions, and take its place in translating the Sacred Scriptures.

TUNGCHOW, 1866.

(For The Missionary Recorder.)

"SOCIAL LIFE OF THE CHINESE;"
BY REV. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE.

BY REV. C. C. BALDWIN.

THE design of this notice is not a labored critique, but a hearty recommendation of the above work, as a valuable contribution to our sources of knowledge. It is in two octavo volumes of nearly a thousand pages, published in the usually attractive style of the Harpers. The work comprises, besides the author's "Jottings about the Chinese, 1861-4," other valuable matter on related subjects.

The whole was revised and arranged during a brief visit in the United States, in 1865, amid

the multiform and pressing demands on the time of "the returned missionary." Its completion was made sadly memorable by a deep domestic affliction. These facts indicate some of the difficulties under which the author labored in the preparation of his book. The arrangement of materials so extensive and minute in details, the composition of supplementary chapters, the writing out an accurate copy, and then overseeing it word by word through the press, give us a favorable impression of his indefatigable perseverance.

It is refreshing to discover in the author's preface his singleness of aim. He brought to his task a thorough experience of the ways of the people, they having often "vexed his righteous soul with their unlawful deeds." And this experience was pervaded, from the beginning to the end of his task, by a conscientious fidelity to truth which would not knowingly tolerate a single shade of statement calculated to give his readers a wrong impression. He declares in advance, "if any undue coloring or prominence has been given to any custom, or a false statement made in regard to any subject, no one will regret it more sincerely than the author." Such a sentiment, in gilt letters and hung conspicuously in every composer's library, would be of use in these modern days. The million-tongued press might, perchance, give us more of the solid grain of truth, and less of the empty husks of fancy. It is a peculiar qualification of good authorship to aim at truth rather than popularity; or, though seeking the latter, yet to spurn the low principle of doing it at the expense of the former.

The style of "Social Life" is usually free from infelicities of expression. It is in good plain English, and aims to convey thought and description in the clearest terms. As the author seeks to influence and impress us by facts in their naked deformity or beauty, rather than by meretricious ornament or false grace of diction, his style is neither ambitious nor stilted. Perhaps most readers will think the volumes rather overburdened with minutiae of detail. The author seems to have been conscious of this, for he says, quite ingenuously, "if circumstances had favored, a more extensive pruning of words, phrases, and sentences could have been made to advantage." We trust that he will be spared to carry out the implied wish in subsequent editions of his valuable work. In the meantime we have the compensatory assurance that we are invited to a survey of facts, not fancies, and that our author has ingeniously, but fairly, disarmed unfriendly criticism. The volumes are readable, full of interesting description, and mete out impartial justice to all sides of Chinese character. As a work for reference we believe them to be fully

reliable, and hence invaluable to every true friend of the Chinese. A glance at the wide range of topics in "contents" and "index" almost excites our surprise that they could be fairly treated within the allotted space, and still invite a prospective "pruning."

In the *arrangement* of subjects a score of writers would probably hit on a score of methods. Many of the minute topics would do as well in one place as another, and the best that an author can do in such an emergency is to fit them in where they do the least harm to established laws of symmetry. Whether Mr. Doolittle has succeeded in this, either to his own satisfaction or that of his readers, it is impossible to say, as tastes often differ widely about the mere externals of a subject. The *general order* of arrangement, however, is a natural one. The *introduction* describes Foo-chow in its historical, statistical and missionary aspects. Many facts of interest, as to streets and street scenes, trade, with its movements and facilities, are interwoven in the narrative. In vol. I., the first eight chapters portray the inner, domestic life and customs of the people. Chapters 9-11 describe their pantheon, worship, and religious beliefs and practices. Chapters 12-14 give some account of the government, its workings in many particulars, and the state religion. Chapters 15-17 dwell on the competitive examinations, and related customs; and the volume closes with a chapter of anecdotes. The first fifteen chapters of vol. II. furnish a mass of Chinese usages and superstitions for our inspection. These are of all sorts,—occasional and annual, personal and social, civil and religious. They belong, moreover, to all grades of society, and relate to almost every conceivable want of human life whether real or fancied. The chapter on *business customs*, and the one on *opium and opium smoking* will claim the reader's special interest. Chapter 16, on Scripture and Chinese customs, instructs the reader both by resemblance and contrast, and is a fitting link to what follows on missionary topics in chapters 17 and 18. The last chapter, headed "Interior View of Peking," is a sort of appendix, and occupies, as all will admit, the right place. The volumes are very profusely, yet aptly, illustrated with embellishments,—more than 150 in number,—which greatly enhance their intrinsic value.

In review, we observe that the work furnishes much needed information about Chinese life and character. It gives the *facts* without which knowledge is always crude and hypothetical. If we would think kindly of a people, sympathize with them, and know the extent of their need, social or religious, we must have the facts of their mode of life spread before us. These are furnished by the volumes under review, in the most thorough and exhaustive

style. So thinks a cotemporary of the English press in China, who pertinently observes that our author's production is in the style of "monographs published expressly to exhaust the subjects treated on, so far as they are known." The descriptions of idolatrous practices have another excellent feature. They are impartial, in that they allow the Chinese themselves to give testimony as to the source and *rationale* of those practices. The author gives, too, the figures, the plain *arithmetic* of idolatry, which is so baldly suggestive of its formal character. Heathenism is reduced to a sort of mechanical or mathematical science:—so many candles, cups of wine, incense sticks, bowings and head-knockings. Our meaning is not that idolatry *wholly* excludes sentiments of hope, fear, conviction, and the like; but that its intense formalism awfully debases and perverts them. But it should be observed that such a work as "Social Life" answers another important end. It proves that the Chinese have some pleasing traits. They are not lost beyond the power of redemption. They have irreversible claims to our sympathy, on the ground both of their good and their bad qualities; and their character needs only the adornment of Christian graces to make them worthy associates of the good of all lands.

Our author frankly states his "moral convictions" in reference to Confucianism and kindred topics. To the justness of such convictions a cotemporary writer takes exceptions. Some seem to discern in the Confucian precepts a kind of second Gospel, or system of morality, so perfect that it measurably answers the needs of human nature. We refer however in this remark to the tendencies of some modern pseudo-theologians, not to any known opinion of the writer referred to. We trust that he is not in such evil company. However that may be, the author of "Social Life" can afford to bear the undeserved imputation that his "reflections" labor under a "shallowness of application" to his subject, when he finds himself in the goodly number of American and British Christians, who make it their life study to discover the principles of the Bible and their application to all phases of human life. It is well to have our attention directed to this subject. The fact is, we may err on either extreme,—lauding Confucius beyond his deserts, or decrying him as worthless. We have yet to learn that any missionary does the latter. The Confucian system of ethics answered a valuable end as a partially restraining influence in primitive times, yet he very pointedly taught the unchristian doctrine of *revenge*. The flood tide of *human* teaching can rise no higher, and we assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that all systems of morality, not founded on the will of God as the motive force

rest essentially on the utilitarian basis of personal or social selfishness. They lack the main principle of vitality, a close relation to God's will and glory, and the final awards of justice. And hence, as a thoroughly reformatory power, Confucianism fails. The proof is at hand in "Social Life of the Chinese," and in the uniform testimony of those who have long mingled most intimately with this people: We never meet with a heathen Chinese who proves to be perfectly honest and truthful. Other phases of character need not be cited. But we must be indulged in quoting from a Chinese scholar a few well-considered sentences, worthy of our careful attention: "He (Confucius) threw no new light on any of the questions which have a world-wide interest. He gave no impulse to religion. He had no sympathy with progress. His influence has been wonderful, but it will henceforth wane. My opinion is that the faith of the nation in him will speedily and extensively pass away." (The Chinese Classics, vol. I.; Prolegomena, 113.) Mr. Doolittle—it is asserted—"attaches too much importance" to ceremonies in Confucian temples. He ought to term them "a recognition of the virtues of the sage," rather than "*religious* rites." Now, it is quite true that Confucianism, strictly speaking, is not a religious creed. Yet adoration is paid to him, as a deified man, and so it is opposed to the decalogue. The literati are taught from childhood to look to him, not as their Exemplar merely, but their Patron in the highest sense. His tablet and his names and titles on the walls of school rooms are revered as sacred objects, and his spirit in them invoked as a present deity to bless his disciples. If, then, the literati have any religious sentiment at all, we humbly conceive that it exhibits itself as really in the Confucian ceremonies as in those enacted before *Tien* or *Shangti*. If this view is correct, it seems too great a feat for weak human nature to "bow in the house of Rimmon," and still keep the heart in active affiance to God, and expect His "pardon in this thing." In a word, Confucianism is an odd mixture of the secular, or civil, and the religious. Some of the moral maxims of its great teacher are admirable specimens of pith and point, but his political creed he found to his cost rather visionary. He overrated the power of example, and failed to realize in his teachings a sufficient basis for success in politics. Apropos to the religio-secular character of Confucian worship, is an instructive passage in Romish history. The question whether the worship of the Confucian and ancestral tablets was sinful convulsed Mother Church during a period of some seventy years. In 1645 and 1656 we have two opposing *infallible* decrees. In 1704 a decree of Clement XI. reversed the previous one, and denounced Confucian and ancestral worship as

unlawful. The Jesuitical faction was sustained by the *heathen* Emperor, who in the year 1700 declared that those rites were "political." But is it not safer to conclude that discussion had evolved light; that the sober second thought of the Church, fortified by the prayers of the faithful, was correct, and that the decree of 1704 was super-infallible?

The sad tendency of many who still covet the Christian name is to secularize Christianity. A sentimental atheism excuses many heathenish rites as harmless. Its advocates imagine their mental vision keen enough to perceive that "all religions are kin," and are "beginning to be dimly discerned as gradual developments of man's moral nature!!" Just so, of course, but with the one sublime exception of the true faith. Men's systems, either as independent creeds or as foul excrescences on the divine, are indeed such "developments," from Adam down to the modern skeptic. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Skepticism and materialism give us such disgusting spectacles as were witnessed in India some years since, when Anglo-Saxons—one or more—joined *con amore* in idol processions! That was being recreant, not to our glorious Christianity only, but to a true manhood! It was a kinship and affiliation of religions about as low on the genealogical scale as could be well reached. A candid perusal of "Social Life" ought to be a sufficient antidote to such vagaries of religious science. It rebukes them, not by argument, but by stubborn facts. Here is a great nation, possessing something good in a *civil* sense, yet so full of hypocrisy and lies that Chinese deception has become the world's by-word. So far as we can see, its only safeguard from total ruin is found in a few good precepts on the "human relations," and the sentiment of self-interest in the common business of life. To guide and give expression to their religious cravings, they have a legion host of debasing superstitions. The relation of cause and effect in their present condition seems too patent to escape even the casual observer. This dead Confucianism, with all else that binds them in spiritual vassalage to sin, is to be thoroughly purged, or rather superseded by the holy precepts of Christ.

Foochow, February, 1867.

(For The Missionary Recorder.)

FOOCHOW MISSION OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.

BY REV. C. C. BALDWIN.

THIS mission was established Jan. 2d, 1847, by Rev. Stephen Johnson, from the Siam Mission. Since that time it has received the following accessions to its corps of laborers:—

Rev. L. B. Peet and Mrs. R. C. Peet (also of the Siam Mission), Sep., 1847; Rev. S. Cummings and Mrs. Cummings, Rev. C. C. Baldwin and Mrs. Baldwin, and Rev. William L. Richards, (son of Rev. William Richards, missionary at the Sandwich Islands,) May, 1848; Mrs. Johnson, formerly Miss Caroline Selmer, of Stockholm, Sweden, a teacher in Miss Aldersey's Seminary, Ningpo, under the auspices of the London Society for Female Education in the East, Dec., 1840; Rev. J. Doolittle and Mrs. S. A. H. Doolittle, May, 1850; Rev. C. Hartwell and Mrs. Hartwell, June, 1853; Rev. S. F. Woodin and Mrs. Woodin, Feb., 1860.

The losses by death were of Mr. Richards (who died near St. Helena on the passage to the U. S.), in June, 1851, Mrs. Doolittle, in June, 1856, and Mrs. Peet, in July, 1856, at Foochow, and Mr. Cummings, Aug., 1856, in the U. S. The losses by departures from the field were of Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, returning to the U. S. in Dec., 1852, in consequence of Mr. J.'s ill health, and the transference of Mr. Doolittle and Mrs. L. E. Doolittle to the North China Mission, in 1864. The latter, as also Mrs. H. L. Peet, joined the mission in 1859. Our present force consists of four families, one being absent in the United States. The aggregate of years of labor during the twenty years of the existence of the mission is 165 years. This estimate is from dates of arrivals, and makes no deductions for temporary absences.

The positions now occupied for our operations, aside from those in the city and suburbs of Foochow, are the district cities of Changloh and Yungfuh, and the country stations of Nangsü, K'waisü and Langpwo. The most distant of these is the city of Yungfuh, situate 40 miles S. W. from Foochow, and there are hundreds of intermediate villages with populations ranging from a few hundreds to five and even ten thousands, which will be naturally reached from the central station or stations just mentioned. The mission has one brick church in foreign style of architecture, with cupola and foreign bell, and also occupies eight chapels at the main and out stations. There are three regularly organized churches: the number of communicants is 63—the whole number from the first being 82. The two small boarding schools, one for boys and one for girls, have 23 pupils. There is also a girls' day school of 13 pupils. The books and tracts (including sheets) distributed during 1865 numbered 30,000. The number of copies from the beginning is about 580,000, and the number of pages over fourteen millions. We have as yet no ordained native minister. The corps of

helpers, or preachers, numbers nine. Our system of labor embraces the departments of chapels, schools, and meetings for prayer and conference, a quarterly examination of the native preachers on portions of the Scriptures, and the preparation by them of essays on doctrinal and practical themes previously assigned.

It may be admitted that to human view our mission labors under some discouragements. The people with whom we have to do are most insufferably proud and conceited, and for a long series of years, since the advent of the Manchus and the fierce inroads of the famous Coshinga, their pride has not been mellowed down by civil or foreign wars. Our mission, too, is a small one, and since the opening of the northern field our weak faith sometimes anticipates a serious difficulty in securing needed reinforcements for the work. Yet, after all, there is much to encourage. To say nothing of the divine promises which amply suffice to establish and fortify our faith, we have the actual fruits of hard work spread out in the face of the world and the church. These fruits are souls born into the kingdom of grace. If, during this score of years, our own and the sister missions number converts by hundreds, why may not the hundreds become thousands? The immortal seed of truth and the divine Spirit have most evidently asserted their presence and power in hearts once heathen. This proves beyond all reasonable contradiction that the work of missions here is gloriously successful and full of promise. The caviller, of course, sees in the lives and dollars and preaching and printed pages spent on the heathen a ruinous and shameful waste. But the eye of faith sees, and clearly too, truth widely prevalent and vital ideas sinking beyond mortal ken only to sap most fatally the very foundations of idolatry. Take two illustrations of the process now going steadily forward. The first man baptized in Foochow was a Mr. Ting. He periled his salvation by willful deception and perjury, and was, consequently, excommunicated. We fear he may prove to be only a convert made by man, not by the Lord. Yet, though years have elapsed since his sad defection, he seems somehow to retain a relish for the truth and the society of the good. Another was a miserable opium smoker. He was induced to give up his pipe, and by God's grace the cleansing process issued at last in his thorough conversion. He is a man of good intellect and fair knowledge of the Scriptures, and he now preaches the gospel to his countrymen. The history of missions in China is full of such instances, which prove the cheering fact of a solid success. God is indeed with us.

Our sketch begins with a name dear to the mission—that of the Rev. Stephen Johnson. A brief quotation from a narrative by his pen will form a fitting close. “In Fuh-Chau from the first there has been great harmony and love among the missionaries of the different boards—being united in their English preaching on the Sabbath, in their communion services, the monthly concert, and in a weekly prayer meeting. To the writer the recollection of these precious seasons is sweet, and he would rejoice again to participate in them, and in the work of preaching Christ to dying souls in Fuh-Chau, should Providence please to grant him this blessed privilege. May this mission, which he in weakness was permitted to commence, be abundantly blessed as the instrument of salvation to the perishing.” (Newcomb’s *Cyclopedia of Missions*, 1854, page 277.) In the course of time circumstances have necessitated partial changes in the external relations of these missions, but we trust that the pure and loving sentiments just quoted find a ready response in all our hearts. “United we stand, divided we fall.”

Foochow, December, 1866.

(For *The Missionary Recorder*.)

AMER. M. E. MISSION, FOOCHOW.

BY REV. S. L. BALDWIN.

On the 27th of May, 1846, the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the American Methodist Episcopal Church resolved to establish a mission in China. On the 26th of March, 1847, it was resolved that the mission be located at Foochow; and on the 15th of April, Rev. M. C. White and wife, and Rev. J. D. Collins, sailed from Boston for China.—They arrived at Foochow, Sept. 6th, 1847, which may be considered the date of the establishment of the mission. They were reinforced in April, 1848, by the arrival of Rev. H. Hickok and wife, and Rev. R. S. Maclay. Before this time, a Chinese house had been fitted up for a mission residence, Mr. White had opened a dispensary, and Mr. Collins had commenced a day-school. A large number of tracts had also been printed. The first death in the mission circle occurred May 25th, 1848, when Mrs. White was called to her rest. In January, 1849, two more schools were opened, and Messrs. Collins and Maclay went 60 miles up the river, distributing tracts and preaching to the people, who seemed civil and willing to listen. In February, Mr. and Mrs. Hickok were obliged to return to America, on account of the failure of Mr. Hickok’s health. In 1851, Mr. Collins was obliged to return home, where he died in 1852. The following table will suffi-

ciently indicate the changes which have occurred from time to time in the missionary force. It is worthy of remark, however, that Rev. R. S. Maclay and family were left the sole representatives of the mission from Jan. 16th, 1854, when Dr. Wiley returned to the U. S., to June 18th, 1855, when Rev. Dr. Wentworth and wife arrived. It should also be mentioned that Rev. N. Sites and family resided at Ngu-k’ang 15 miles in the country, from Nov. 8th, 1862, to April 5th, 1865.

<i>Names of Missionaries.</i>	<i>Arrived Foochow.</i>	<i>Left for Home.</i>	<i>Returned to China.</i>	<i>Died.</i>
Rev. M. C. White,	1847	1852
Mrs. J. I. White,	1847	1848
Rev. J. D. Collins,	1847	1851	1852
Rev. H. Hickok,	1848	1849
Mrs. E. G. Hickok,	1848	1849
Rev. R. S. Maclay,	1848	1859	1861
Miss H. C. Sperry,*	1850	1859	1861
Rev. I. W. Wiley, M.D.	1851	1854
Mrs. F. J. Wiley,	1851	1853
Rev. J. Colder,	1851	1853
Mrs. E. C. Colder,	1851	1853	1858
Miss M. Seely,†	1851	1852
Rev. E. Wentworth, D.D.	1855	1861
Mrs. A. M. Wentworth,	1855	1855
Rev. O. Gibson,	1855	1865
Mrs. E. C. Gibson,	1855	1865
Rev. S. L. Baldwin,	1859	1860	1862
Mrs. N. M. Baldwin,	1859	1860	1861
Miss B. Woolston,	1859
Miss S. H. Woolston,	1859
Miss P. E. Potter,‡	1859	1861
Rev. C. R. Martin,	1860	1864
Mrs. M. E. A. Martin,	1860	1865
Rev. N. Sites,	1861
Mrs. S. M. Sites,	1861
Rev. S. L. Binkley,	1862	1863
Mrs. E. R. Binkley,	1862	1863
Mrs. E. E. Baldwin,	1862
Rev. V. C. Hart,	1866
Mrs. J. A. Hart,	1866
Rev. L. N. Wheeler,	1866
Mrs. M. E. Wheeler,	1866

* Married to Rev. R. S. Maclay, 1850.

† Married to Rev. M. C. White, 1851.

‡ Married to Rev. E. Wentworth, D. D., 1859.

This shows an aggregate of 141 years of missionary labor,—fourteen ordained missionaries laboring 69 years, and eighteen missionary ladies 72 years.

On the 3d of August, 1855, a large and convenient church was dedicated in the southern suburbs of the city; on the 19th of October, a Chinese church on the south side of the river was dedicated; on the 26th of November, a Boys’ School was commenced by Rev. O. Gibson; on the 28th of Dec., a church for English service, near the mission residences, was dedicated. On the 14th of June, 1857, the first convert was baptized, and received into church membership. In July, a convert who had been baptized at Hongkong in 1851, was received on certificate from a church in America, where he had gone with Rev. Mr. Colder. In

January, 1858, the oldest son of a family named Hū was received. From this family the Mission has since had eight members, three of them in time becoming preachers. The father died in the faith. The mother is still living, and often expresses gratitude to God that her sons are preaching the gospel. One of the grandsons has recently united with the church, thus giving us the pleasing and encouraging spectacle of three generations united in the service of Christ.

The year 1859 was signalized by the commencement of a boarding school for girls, under the care of the Misses Woolston; and by the extension of our mission work into the country. At the end of 1858, there were fourteen members connected with the native church. No sooner had a little band of Christians been thus gathered, than they began to make known the good tidings they had received to their heathen friends. Some of these resided in the country, about fifteen miles north-west from Foochow. The faithful labors of the eldest son of the Hū family, followed up by visits from Rev. Dr. Maclay, resulted in the conversion of a number of the people; so that in March, 1859, seven were admitted to baptism, and in August fourteen more were added to the church. This was the beginning of our country work, and from this region the work has extended, until it now embraces the stations of Ngu-k'ang, Kwi-hung, Kan-chia, Sieu-me-ka, and Yek-iong, with sixty-three members and twelve probationers. The first chapel of the mission inside of the city walls, located in East Street, was dedicated April 26th, 1863. It was destroyed by a mob, in Jan., 1864, but replaced by an enlarged and improved building, which was dedicated in the following September. Various providential circumstances led to the opening of preaching places in most of the district cities of the Prefecture, and in several large towns and villages in different portions of the country. As the mission has gone forward in faith, entering the doors opened by divine providence, God has blessed its labors; until now the work in the outside regions has a larger membership, and gives better promise of success than the city work.

It may be mentioned, as a matter of encouragement, that while but one convert was received in the first ten years of the Mission's history, the six years following added 100 to our number, in three years more another hundred were added, and the prospect is that the future will show a much more rapid increase.

The present statistics are—Members, 228; Probationers, 130; Baptized children, 75; Total, 423.

SCHOOLS.—The Mission has, from the outset, approved of schools as a valuable auxiliary in carrying on the great work. It has now one

Boarding School for boys, with 18 pupils; one Boarding School for girls, with 26 pupils; and eleven day schools, with 164 pupils,—making a total of 198 children under Christian instruction. Without exception, the graduates of the boys' school are members of the church. Two of them are preaching the Word. All the present pupils are Church members. Of the pupils of the girl's school, 7 are connected with the Church, and its graduates go forth to shed a Christian influence upon the circles in which they move.

THE PRESS.—From the first, the Mission has given the printing and distribution of the Bible and of tracts a prominent place in its work. For 15 years, its printing was done from blocks in the Chinese style. In 1861, a font of small Chinese type was purchased from the London Mission foundry at Hongkong, and a press, with full fonts of English type, was received from New York. The Printing Office was under the direction of Rev. N. Sites until Dec. 1862, when it came under the charge of the writer. In 1864, a font of large type and another press were procured. The value of the office and its working material is \$5,000. Since July, 1866, the press has been under the charge of Rev. L. N. Wheeler. The issues of the press have embraced portions of the Old Testament in the classical style, the whole New Testament, both in classical and colloquial, a large variety of tracts, and a few scientific books. It is impossible now to give the number of books printed, from the beginning. In 1866, over nine millions of pages were issued. Among the original publications of the Mission are a small Geography by Dr. Wentworth, an Arithmetic and a Reference Testament by Rev. O. Gibson—the latter being the first attempt to give Chinese Christians this valuable help to the study of the Scriptures,—a Catechism by Rev. Dr. Maclay, and the Ritual of the M. E. Church. A Dictionary of the Foochow Dialect by Rev. Dr. Maclay and Rev. C. C. Baldwin is now in progress.

BENEVOLENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—The contributions of the native Church to the missionary fund amounted last year to \$84. A special "centenary" contribution offered by the native Church, to aid in erecting a new "Mission House" in New York, amounted to \$80. The whole contributions of the Church for benevolent purposes during the year, amounted to about \$200. Though most of the members are poor, their contributions are constantly increasing.

The missionary contributions of the four circuits for the last quarter amounted to 27,070 cash, equal to \$25.78.

Foochow, February, 1867.

(For The Missionary Recorder.)

INCIDENTS OF A COUNTRY TRIP.

BY REV. N. SITES.

I LEFT Foochow on the 30th of Oct. last, and proceeded by boat 45 miles up the 閩 Min to the district city of 閩清 Min-tsing. Spent six days within the boundary of this district; from thence went westward nearly 60 miles to the 尤溪 Yu-ki district; stopped over three nights in the city, then on still westward about 50 miles further to 沙 Sha, another district city. Here we stopped one night and part of two days. From this place proceeded by boat down stream to 延平 Yeng-ping foo-city: spent Saturday afternoon and Sunday here, and then on by boat to Foochow; having made a circuit of 360 miles—140 of which were traveled on foot, and the remainder by boat—were absent 24 days, visited and preached in the four walled cities above named, and in more than a score of towns and villages.

TRAVELS, SCENERY, PRODUCTS, &c.

After leaving the boat at Min-tsing, we passed directly from the river back some 20 or 30 miles southward, and thence our route lay nearly parallel with the river Min. Traveling on foot, we arranged to make short marches daily, usually from 15 to 18 miles, so that we could preach and distribute books at the various villages. About one third of the road traveled was comparatively level, winding along the valleys, with thriving villages by the way. The remaining two thirds was over mountain paths. At one time we were ascending for over three hours, and this brought us, by successive elevations, I should judge, to twice the height of the Kushan Mountain near Foochow. Here we sometimes passed several miles without seeing a village, or even a house.—Some of the villages through which we passed presented a very striking appearance, from the peculiar construction of their houses. They are mostly of wood, with the spaces between the timbers plastered and whitewashed; thus giving them a very cleanly and neat appearance, and forming quite a pleasant contrast with the mud-colored villages about Foochow.

At one place, after descending a mountain aide, we passed through a dense natural forest of majestic old chestnut, oak, and many other varieties of hard and soft wood, with a heavy underbrush. We were about one hour in passing through this beautiful forest. When about midway we saw a dozen or more monkeys, in all their native wildness, skipping from branch to branch and from tree to tree. We halloosed at them, and the fellows scampered off in every

direction; but one saucy old fellow, high up on the topmost branches, looked at us defiantly, and refused to run off, though we called out at him vociferously. They were as much a curiosity to my burden-carriers and native helper as to me, they having never seen the like before.

When 150 miles from Foochow we entered the immense tea growing region, and during the next 30 miles we were continually meeting with this interesting shrub. Every rounded knob or hill was covered with the tea plant, and on steep hill sides it was often cultivated in terraces. The tea hills present a pleasing view to the eye. We gathered some of the leaves, the flowers, and the seeds, and passed on. In the Sha district I saw many fields of buckwheat in full bloom, reminding me of long ago—of fields on my father's farm in my native Ohio.

RECEPTION BY THE PEOPLE.

Our first day's travel on foot, after leaving the boat, brought us, about sundown, to a village of some 500 inhabitants. As we approached the center gateway, in front of the largest house, a half dozen men and boys stood on the high steps gazing at us. I as usual went leisurely along and saluted them, and made as though I were going in. They seemed to be of the same mind, and so I went on till I reached the central great hall, back of the large open court. The children and men soon gathered around to see and hear the foreigner. All was quiet, and without any noisy excitement. The forms of politeness on their part were attended to—the pipe and the tea offered. I told them we had some books to give them, and at once began to arrange my books on a large table, with my leather bound Bible as the foundation. As there seemed a little coldness on their part, I then brought forth our map of the world, in Chinese; opened one copy, explained it, marked out with pencil our track through the ocean from my native land to this country and then gave it, with four tracts, to the prominent man of the house. But, by the way, I had given my passport to this man to read soon after we went in, and told him we were going on a few days to Yu-ki city, which would require several days' travel. This passport with the official stamp always gives people an assurance of our business, and removes distrust. Well, now we had done our preaching, given out our books, and made known our willingness to stay with them over night; but they did not manifest any haste or interest about the latter. So we began to shoulder our things, thinking of our prospects for the night in a Buddhist temple some miles in the distance, when, to our surprise, they gave us a plain, direct invitation to remain with them till morning. Our baggage and

our persons were now transferred from this large public hall to a more private sitting room, to the right hand side of the large open court. This was all the Magistrate could have asked. Here we talked more familiarly with the people, a dozen or more gathering around. In due time a fine supper was served up on the center table for us, and, after our host and we were seated, I remarked that Christians give thanks to God before eating; and, requesting their silence, I asked my helper to give thanks, which he did very appropriately. We then proceeded to partake of such things as were set before us, asking no questions for conscience' sake. While eating, I discoursed about various western inventions, such as the steam-boat, cars, telegraph, &c. After supper the table was cleared, without any effort the conversation, in a general way, ceased; and soon my native helper was in the midst of a long, clear, and earnest discourse, embracing most of the primary doctrines of Christianity. This through, I entertained the people with remarks, showing them the folly of their lucky days, and lucky sites for graves and building places. I showed them from the Bible that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and assured them that he did not make this hill bad, and that one good, that all the works of his creation were good, very good. And so with the lucky days; I told them, the sunlight makes the day, that God made the sun, and that every day was good. I then told them that sorrow and happiness do not spring from the earth or from the day; but that they who hate God and transgress his commandments receive the wages of sin, while they who love God and keep his commandments shall be blessed for thousands of generations, &c., &c.

About 10 o'clock we were directed to our sleeping apartments. They led me along a narrow hall, up a flight of stairs, across a wide floor, thence in to a fine upper chamber—the guest room. A table, two new chairs, and a new bedstead were the furniture; and here were my quarters for the night. My helper had retired in a small bedroom near by. Three or four of the younger men of the house, who came with me to my room, lingered, and asked questions, seeming anxious to protract our conversation. I soon became much interested in talking with them, and hardly knew how time was passing until nearly midnight, when unexpectedly a little luncheon was brought me, consisting of a nice piece of chicken and a bowl of vermicelli. Soon after all retired, and I went to my rest for the night. Next morning breakfast was served up in good style in the same place where we had eaten our supper. Breakfast over, we were accompanied by one of the householders to several other houses in

the village, where we gave out books, talked of a Savior, and exhorted the people to repentance. We then returned to our place of lodging, offered a present to our host, but he would not accept anything, saying that he would not have taken us in for money. We could only express our thanks to him, and ask God's blessing to rest upon this household of seventeen families.

Did I not fear occupying too much space, I might give instances of equally kind receptions by poor families in little houses, where they even gave up some of their own poor comforts, that they might the better entertain us. And again, among the literati, in families in good circumstances, I might enumerate instances of the most genuine kindly feeling toward us, and the most hospitable entertainment. We often felt, of a truth, the Lord prepares our way before us.

PREACHING, CHRISTIAN BOOKS FOUND AMONG THE PEOPLE, &c.

In a village sixty-five miles from Foochow, at a school in a private family, we found the teacher, a young man of twenty-two years, and a literary graduate. He was not in when we called, but one of the largest pupils opened the teacher's bookcase, and took out a Bible and some other Christian books. We were about leaving when the teacher came in; he urged us to stop longer, and talked with us pleasantly about the Christian doctrines. He asked my helper what the word "Lamb" meant, as used in "Revelation," and about some other portions of the Word, showing he had been reading the "Book of Books." Again, some miles further on, we stopped in a small store on the road-side; were furnished seats and opportunity to preach to the people, who soon gathered around. We gave out a few books, the shopkeeper seeing which, reached to one of his shelves, and brought down a book, old but well kept. It was "Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress;" and then another—it was the old edition, large type, of the "Acts of the Apostles." He had received them at Foochow years ago. We were glad, and took courage.

At a village in the Yuki district, about ninety miles distant from Foochow, where we stopped for the night, I was, a little before sundown, marching about the streets as usual, talking a little here, preaching there, and sometimes giving away a few books. Passing a temple, or hall for ancestral worship, I stepped in. Here were about thirty of the important men of the place, seated at three tables, enjoying a feast. As I drew near they all left their seats and came toward me. I tried to have them finish their feast; but to no purpose. They asked me to take a sip of their wine, and I told them to be seated, and I would eat with them. So I sat down, and took a small cup of

the wine; also ate of the chicken and vermicelli, both of which were nicely cooked, and well seasoned. A man came with a pint bowl of wine, steaming in my face, and urged me to drink it. But I persistingly refused. While eating, they made inquiries about my business here, and who sent me, &c. I told them all, plainly. Then they wanted to see my books; I gave to one or two, then all wanted. I had with me ten or fifteen Genach's tract, "Chinese and Christian Doctrines compared," and of the "Discourse on Faith;" also two sheet tracts, "The Saviour Jesus," and the "Sunday Sheet." I trust it was a providential opening to spread the books among those who could read them. The sun was now set, the feast over, and I walked back and rejoined my company at the inn. I found my helper in conversation with a fine looking elderly man by the name of Ting, who has a large assorted store in the place. That night he allowed us to preach in his store room, and many heard the Gospel. This Mr. Ting seemed exceedingly anxious to hear, stayed by us till we left, and urged us to stay longer. A younger brother of this store-keeper came to see us the next morning, just as we were leaving; and as our road passed through his village, about a mile distant, he went with us. As we drew near his house he urged us to turn aside, stop, and drink a cup of tea. We did so; and spent nearly an hour preaching and talking to a house full of people. We also gave them books; whereupon one man stepped into his room, and brought out a well preserved book, which he had received at Foochow. On opening it, I found it bore the inscription, "Gospel of Luke," was dated "1853," and had the letters "A. B. C. F. M." on the title page. I showed him that the same book was in the Bible from which I preached, and urged him to its careful perusal. I might add two or three more incidents under this head, which I met with in still more remote points of my travel; but let these suffice. I should say that in every case where we found Christian books among the people, they were brought out, or spoken of, without our having made any inquiry for them. Surely this should encourage the older missionaries—who have labored so long, and so indefatigably in scattering the seed broadcast over the land—to hope that the good seed may yet spring up, and bring forth an hundred fold.

KINDNESSES RECEIVED FROM OFFICIALS—OPIUM SMOKERS—MORE PREACHING.

On arriving at Yen-ping city, we went directly to the Prefect's yamen, sent in to the Prefect several small Christian books, a map of the world, and my card and passport. I desired the servant to say to him that as we had but a short time to stop in the city, I would

prefer not to trouble his honor with a call in person, but that I greatly desired to express my thanks to him for the many favors we had received from his people, both in the Yu-ki and Sha districts. The books and message were taken to the prefect, and soon his card was sent out to me, with thanks for the books; also, a message expressing a desire to have me call, but as I had intimated want of time he would not urge me to do so. We then went to various parts of the city, and were most agreeably disappointed at the friendly manner in which we were received by the citizens; being several times invited into their private houses, where we preached and gave out books. At the Sha district city, 180 miles from Foochow, my card, books, and message were kindly received by the magistrate. In return, he sent his card, and two policemen to conduct us to lodgings which he assigned us, in a large temple near by.

We came in sight of the Yu-ki district city about noon, on Friday, and reached an inn in the suburbs at 1½ o'clock, P. M. I got into a little back room of the inn; but the news that a foreigner was there spread, and soon the narrow street was crowded. The poor old man and woman of the inn knew not what to do, for their rooms were full of people, standing on stools, on the tables, and anywhere, so as to see. I went out among them (in my shirt sleeves, for I was trying to wash and dress, preparatory to going to pay my respects to the magistrate), and marched every man out of the inn, then stood on the steps, and told them to look at me; but that I was only a man, with eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands and feet, just about the same as themselves. (Laughter.) I then asked them not to impose on the poor inn-keeper, but to go away and allow me to finish dressing; which they accordingly did. But new crowds came, and the old lady would come and beseech me to go out again and send them away; and so I did three times, before I succeeded in completing my toilet. Taking my passport, I proceeded to the magistrate's office. Sent in my card, with a Bible, and a map of the world. I then stood back to quiet the crowd which had gathered around me. But in a minute or two I was invited to enter, and was conducted to the private reception room, and seated. A minute, and the magistrate came in, in official robes, made a most handsome bow, and I endeavored to do the same. He then conducted me to the highest seat, and sat down by my side. Tea was brought, and as we sipped he asked, and I answered questions. I then referred to our work and said, "the doctrines we preach are contained in the book I sent you." The magistrate replied, "Yee, thank you for it." "The map," I said, "is also quite

a true representation of the positions of the various kingdoms of the earth. Again he expressed his thanks. He then said he would send a note to the head priest of a certain large temple, and have us stop there, instead of remaining at the small and crowded inn, for which I expressed my gratitude. I then took my hat, and bade his honor be quiet. But he arose and accompanied me across an inner court, to the second gate; had the doors of honor opened through which we passed, and I finally took leave of him in the presence of the crowd. One of his interpreters soon came to the inn, and we packed up and followed him to the spacious temple. As we passed along the street, the crowd ran before and behind us, crying "ai yah," and laughing, as it were for joy. The policemen requested me to talk to the people in the large hall of the temple, and I did so, greatly to my satisfaction. During the evening, several of the elderly men who came in apologized for the poor accommodations they had for us, and were very kind and polite. We considered the two large bed rooms, parlor, kitchen, and public halls, which they had given us to use, all that could be desired.

About ten o'clock, A. M., a great crowd came pouring into the temple, saying that the magistrate was sending his servants with a *kaung* of presents for us. I sent my helper to receive the things, and continued talking to the people, and giving out books. I soon went into our reception room, met the chief steward, and expressed my thanks for the several fine dishes of fowl and pastry on the table. About two o'clock, P. M., two more men from the yamun came in, sat down, and heard my helper finish a discourse on the commandments. They informed us that the magistrate was coming to call on us. I told them that was too much for us to expect or accept. But they said, "no, it is all proper." Presently a flood of people came, rushing into the temple, saying, "the magistrate is coming! the magistrate is coming!" And, true enough, there he was, with his retinue. I went through all the forms of receiving him, as politely as I knew how. He smoked the pipe, and we sipped our tea, while we conversed together. I expressed my thanks for his fine present, and my regret that I had nothing to give him in return. I spoke of my pleasure at the manner in which his people had heard our message, and expressed a hope that the books which we had distributed might aid him in his official capacity, by making his people better. He apologized for not being able to come the next morning and escort me on leaving the city. I then accompanied him to his sedan chair, when we parted.

Footnote, December, 1860.

THE SALUTATORY

Reader, our paper is before you. What do you think of its mechanical execution, its original and selected matter? May we venture to hope that your criticisms will not be less indulgent than its pretensions are modest?

The appearance of this sheet is the result of mature deliberation on our part, and by suggestions from others who have expressed a deep interest in the project. The circular which was sent out, in the last Missionary Directory, to the missionaries in China and Japan, met with general and hearty response. Men, whose long experience in the missionary field, and whose position and reputation in the East entitle them to be heard with respect, have encouraged this enterprise and predicted its success. Indeed, it is evident from correspondence in our possession, that the necessity for a missionary organ in China has been long and widely felt, and that the existence of such a periodical would be attended with desirable results. We do not claim that the "Recorder" is a worthy successor of the "Chinese Repository," but we put it forth as initiatory of what increased facilities or individual enterprise may yet develop into a large newspaper or portly magazine.

We do not here prescribe rules or limits to govern the editorial conduct of these columns. It is proper to state, however, that while we desire the "Recorder" to be recognized as a medium of communication for thinkers and workers in all departments of science and literature—who are engaged in the laudable effort to increase the general knowledge of Oriental lands and their inhabitants—our first object shall be to make it an active agent, an aggressive appliance, in the great work of evangelization.

And now, ye who toil for the Master, hear the word of exhortation! As you look out upon the field already ripe for the harvest, or thrust in the sickle to gather sheaves for the heavenly garner; as you go about among a "people sitting in the region and shadow of death," proclaiming a divine Savior and a resurrection from sin and the grave, or while in the retirement of the study and secret communings with the Father of Spirits, you are inspired with many thoughts. Sometimes they are living thoughts—burning thoughts! Write them on paper, and send them to us, that they may go forth as cheering words, reviving messages, to other toilers who would work well while it is called to-day, but perchance, are faint under the "burden" and "heat." And then, how many suggestive incidents and instructive facts occur within the range of your observation, which we would be glad to chronicle, and many would read with interest and profit. Only let the result of your meditations and experience be put upon the printed page, to swell the Christian literature of the day, and then lain aside in archives to be consulted by the future historian of the Church, and what prescience can measure the value of the aid that may be given to the cause of true evangelism? Will not the attrition of ideas and the collation of views in a single organ evolve greater light and wider conceptions of missionary work than can result from only sending your communications to distant and widely scattered periodicals?

As we can give but brief and superficial attention to the paper each month, its fate must necessarily be determined by correspondents. Shall it live?